

App. Serial No.: 10/784,102

Atty. Docket No.: 0025-013

### REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated December 5, 2007, which has a shortened statutory period for response set to expire March 5, 2008. A three-month extension, to expire June 5, 2008, is requested in a petition filed herewith.

### Claims

Claims 1-48 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-48 are rejected over prior art. Claims 1, 10, 13-14, 17, 24, 27, 39-40, and 42-44 are amended. Claims 2-8, 11-12, 15-16, 18-23, 25-26, 28-38, 41, and 45-48 remain as originally filed or previously presented. Reconsideration is requested.

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to. The Examiner indicates that "integrated circuit chip" should be -- camera integrated circuit chip--. Claim 1 is amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 8 is objected to. The Examiner indicates that "integrated circuit chip" should be -- camera integrated circuit chip--. Claim 8 is amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 10 is objected to. The Examiner indicates that "integrated circuit" should be -- integrated camera circuit--. Claim 10 is amended to now read (in part) "camera integrated circuit." Applicants note that this is different than the language suggested by the Examiner. However, Applicants respectfully point out that the claim element at issue is referring to the "camera integrated circuit" recited in line 2 of Claim 9, and not the "integrated camera circuit and lens module" recited in the preamble of Claim 9.

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to for the same reason as Claim 10. For the reasons set forth in the previous paragraph, Claims 13 and 14 are amended similar to Claim 10.

Claim 47 is objected to. The Examiner indicates that "camera integrated circuit" should be --integrated camera circuit." Applicants respectfully disagree, because the claim element is properly referring to the "camera integrated circuit" recited in line 2 of Claim 9.

App. Serial No.: 10/784,102

Atty. Docket No.: 0025-013

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of all of the objections to Claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 14, and 47..

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 24, 40, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicates that there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the step of" language in the rejected claims. Each of these claims is amended herein to remove "the step of" language. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 24, 40, and 42-44 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16, 27, 28, 30-39, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,199,438 (Appelt). Claims 5, 16 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Appelt in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,009,654 (Kuno). Claims 17-26 and 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuno in view of Appelt. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Appelt in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2004/0109079 (Fujimoto).

The claims are amended herein, as agreed in an Examiner interview, to overcome all of the current rejections. A summary of the interview, including the substantive distinctions of the claims over the prior art of record, is provided below.

Because the claims have been amended as agreed, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

App. Serial No.: 10/784,102

Atty. Docket No.: 0025-013

Interview Summary:

A telephone interview was held on May 15, 2008 to discuss the merits of the present application. Examiner Dillon Durnford-Geszvain, Examiner Nhan Tran, and Applicants' attorney Larry E. Henneman, Jr. participated in the interview.

The Appelt reference was discussed in detail. In particular, Mr. Henneman pointed out that Appelt does not disclose molding a lens holder on an integrated circuit chip. Rather, according to Appelt, a lens (e.g., lens 342 of Fig. 4) is held in place by support component 340 and the device is simply encapsulated with an encapsulant 330. Examiner Durnford-Geszvain indicated that the encapsulant 430 in the embodiment of Fig. 5 held window 442 in place and could, therefore, be considered a holder. Mr. Henneman pointed out that window 442 was positioned on chip 420 prior to the forming of encapsulant 430 and, therefore, encapsulant 430 did not position window 442 with respect to chip 420. It was agreed that Appelt does not disclose or fairly suggest the molding of a lens holder that facilitates the insertion and positioning of a lens with respect to an integrated circuit chip.

Based on the agreed distinctions over the prior art of record, Examiner Durnford-Geszvain, Examiner Tran, and Mr. Henneman together formulated specific claim language to distinguish over the prior art of record. Specific claim language was agreed upon for each of the independent claims. The agreed upon language is incorporated into the independent claims by the present amendment. The agreed upon claim language is also set forth by Examiner Durnford-Geszvain in the interview summary mailed May 20, 2008.

Applicants appreciate and thank the Examiners for their cooperative spirit and constructive assistance in the prosecution of this application.

App. Serial No.: 10/784,102

Atty. Docket No.: 0025-013

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe Claims 48 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner undertake any action other than allowance of Claims 1-48, or if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for further expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at (269) 279-8820.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/4/08Larry E. Henneman, Jr.

Larry E. Henneman, Jr., Reg. No. 41,063  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Henneman & Associates, PLC  
714 W. Michigan Ave.  
Three Rivers, MI 49093

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via facsimile, on the date shown below, to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, at (571) 273-8300.

Date: 6/4/08Larry E. Henneman, Jr.

Larry E. Henneman, Jr.